APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,953	07/08/2003	Young-Gook Ha	3364P116	7127

			EXAMINER
8791	7590	07/18/2006	FABER, DAVID

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/614,953	HA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Faber	2178	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 May 2006*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/21/06*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 17 May 2006.

2.   Claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended.

3.   The rejection of Claims 1, 7, 8, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been

withdrawn necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of Claims 8, and 12 under 35

U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn necessitated by the amendment.

4.   Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 12 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

5.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 21 April 2006 is in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure

statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7.   Claims 1, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing

to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. The use of the term "semantic" is not in

specification, and thus rejected under 112 1st paragraph for not being supported by the

specification, and viewed as new matter.

8.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9.   Claim 1, 8, and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

In regards to Claims 1, 8, and 12, Examiner is confused by Applicant's response

in regards to the explanation of the limitation of the claim, "converting the grammar..."

disclosed in the specification. Page 12, lines 17-20 of the specification clearly state as

is: "The grammar neutral document object is converted into a grammar-connect

document object through a grammar converter, which supports grammar, (e.g. XML

schema, XML DTD, EDI MIG) suitable for a specific business system." However,

Applicant states in the Remarks within the amendment response (Page 9, 3rd

paragraph) that the grammar-connected documents are ordinary text documents.

However, the specification discloses the ability of the use of XML grammar, which help

create XML documents, which may or may not result in ordinary text documents as

Applicant states. Thus, this result making the claim limitation vague and indefinite, and

Examiner's view from the previous Office action remains in effect.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 1-12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Cornelia et al (US Patent #6,065,026, patented 5/16/2000) further in view of Person et

al (Person et al, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Word 97", published 12/16/1996, pp 1-

15) in further view of Meyer, (Meyer, "aTool – Creating Validated XML Documents on

the Fly Using MS Word," published 10/20/2002, pp 113-121).

As per independent Claim 1, Cornelia et al discloses a system comprising:

- a document component library for storing and managing document

    component summary information and document components that represent

    specific concepts; (Column 2, line 66 – Column 3, line 2: discloses a library

    used for storing components which are used to be assembled to create new

    documents. In addition, Column 9, lines 44-49, discloses Find Component

    menu option that is able to display a component dialog disclosing the

    component's name, description, author, text content, etc. Since the

    component contains all this information and displays it, the library stores

components that contain summary information which represent specific

concepts.)

- a document generation rule processor for accumulating document

   components needed for document assembly received from the document

   component library, and generating grammar neutral document objects

   (Column 20, lines 60 – 65: discloses creating documents by dragging and

   dropping language component icons where each icon represents a

   component. Documents are created by the dragging and dropping

   components into a list for the document thus creating non-grammar objects

   within a document. This process acts as document generation rule

   processor.)

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose a document generation rule

formulator that a user employs to designate document generation rules through a

graphic user interface. However, Person et al discloses Microsoft Word contains

templates, which contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of

document. (Page 1) Person et al discloses a form template, where assembly and

context rules are used in which the assembly rules are used to create a table that

creates a form while the context rules are used for font size and font type for the text.

(FIG 6.2) In addition, Person et al discloses that all Word documents are based on a

template wherein the default new document is based on a template containing default

formatting and settings. (Page 5, lines 5-6) Thus, a user employs the designation of

document rules when loading a template in Word. In addition, this process acts as a document generation rule formulator.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's disclosure of templates in Microsoft Word since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency when creating document.

In addition, Cornelia et al and Person et al fail to specifically disclose a document grammar connector for converting the grammar neutral document objects, which are suitable for semantic processing in a program of a computer system, into grammar-connected documents in a human-readable string form used in an actual business. However, Meyer discloses using a tool extension to Microsoft Word (Abstract, lines 1-2, pg 1) that would create validated XML documents using Microsoft World. (Title, pg 1) Meyer's tool would convert the MS Word document into XML generating a grammar-connected document (Page 116, Right Column, lines 30-37) by making sure the document is valid and complaint with its DTD (Page 114, Right Column, Lines 30-31). This process acts as a document grammar connector.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's and Person et al's methods with Meyer's aTool method since it would have provided the aTool as a hybrid solution that offers the benefits of MS Word with the costs of a little less XML support.

As per dependent Claim 2, Cornelia et al discloses:

- a component selector for displaying usable component items that are provided by a corresponding library based on document component summary information searched in the document component library, the document component summary information including at least a component ID, a component name, and a component type, and optionally including various different types of information that represent other components; (Column 9, lines 42-52: Discloses able to using a Find Component menu option to find components based on the component's information such as the component's name in which the system returns with a list of components in the library based on the component's information searched. The user is able to insert components into the document from the component list.)

- a document component assembler for forming an area where component structures are modeled based on user input through a graphic user interface, the user dragging the needed document components appearing in the component selector and dropping the documents at a suitable location in the document component assembler to thereby generate document structures (Column 20, line 60 – Column 21, line 4: Discloses documents being created by dragging and dropping components into a list for the document using a tree viewer. Once the list been created, the word document with complete content is generated by a user action. This creation creates a structured document containing components placed in a structural manner.

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose which such structures are

formulated as assembly rules, and the assembly rules include IDs of all document

components and structural information between each component; and disclose a

context condition compiler for forming an area where context conditions realized

through pairs of conditions and actions are compiled to enable insertion into document

structures, the context condition compiler enabling the formulation of context rules,

which allow the processing of actions, in the document generation rule processor in the

case where conditions are satisfied for a specific business context during document

assembly. However, However, Person et al discloses Word contains templates, which

contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of document. (Page 1)

Person et al discloses in FIG. 6.2 using Microsoft Word where a template is showing

structural information where a table has been implemented to produce a form layout,

and additional structural information created to divide the table into cells where text has

been place. Thus, FIG 6.2 discloses assembly rules used to create a form layout

contain structural information to properly place components for table and text where it

was assembled. In addition, Person et al's discloses where context conditions are used

by the formulation rules where the template created allowing the user to easily enter

information by requiring only the user just to point, click, and type to fill out a form.

(Page 4, Paragraph 4; FIG 6.4)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's

disclosure since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool

one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

In addition, Cornelia et al discloses the author has the ability to get a listing of all the components in the document that displays component identifiers such as the component's name. (Column 11, lines 51-58) Since Person et al discloses Microsoft Word is able to assembled structural information or rules, Word would been able to include the identifiers using the Show Document Components menu option from Cornelia et al's application since Cornelia et al's application is built using Microsoft Word. (Column 6, lines 22-47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's and Person et al's method with the use of identifiers since it would have allowed using computers to assemble documents to reduce the amount of time that attorneys and other individuals who prepare long legal or transactional documents spend on the mechanics of document preparation.

As per dependent Claim 3, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose the assembly rules and the context rules are output as a single document generation rule. However, Person et al discloses Word contains templates, which contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of document. (Page 1) Person et al discloses a specific type of a form template, where assembly and context rules are used in which the assembly rules are used create a table that creates a form while the context rules are used for font size and font type for the text. (FIG 6.2) thus a template

is a single document generation rule involving the combination of assembly and context

rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's

disclosure of templates since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word

template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and

consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

As per dependent Claim 4, Cornelia et al discloses a system:

- the document component summary information for recording various

  document components that constitute business documents and detailed

  information on all components included in a present library; and ; (FIG 26;

  Column 12, line 65 – Column 13, line 1: Discloses the ability to view one

  component from the library which discloses detailed component information

  that is used for business purposes (Column 6, lines 43-47)

- a component library interface for connection to external modules, (FIG. 3;

  Column 5, lines 27-38: Discloses the word processor, as a separate module,

  having an API that interacts with the library object which interacts with the

  library.)

- the document generation rule formulator searches the document component

  summary information through the component library interface, and the

  document generation rule processor uses document component Ids to

  accumulate document components required for document assembly. (Column

6, lines 6-12 discloses the interaction using the library. This disclosure

enables using a Find Component menu option to find components based on

the component's information such as the component's name in which the

system returns with a list of components in the library based on the

component's information searched then allowing the author to insert the

component into document thus outputting onto the document. (Column 9,

lines 42-52))

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically discloses the component Ids are

numbers specific to each component. However, it was well-known to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention that a number can be a name and that

identifiers were programmed as/into numbers within a data structure .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with the disclosure of

numbers used as name as identifiers since it would have allowed a user an easier

method for storing data within a recording medium.

As per dependent Claim 5, Cornelia et al discloses a system:

- wherein the document components stored in the document component library

    include simple components of a single type and complex components

    realized through a structure of a plurality of simple components. (Column 2,

    line 66 – Column 3, line 2 discloses a library containing components which

    are unit of text that is shared among documents. A component may contain

variable text in order to facilitate flexibility and foster re-use. (Column 2, lines

48-50) Column 10, lines 8-34 discloses adding variable text into the

component.)

As per dependent Claim 6, Cornelia et al discloses a system:

- a component assembler for using document component IDs to accumulate

  from the document component library the document components required in

  the assembly rule, resulting assembled components are outputted. (Column

  9, lines 42-52: Discloses using a Find Component menu option to find

  components based on the component's information such as the component's

  name in which the system returns with a list of components in the library

  based on the component's information searched then allowing the author to

  insert the component into document thus outputting onto the document.)

Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose assembling the document components

using structural information between components and reading assembly and a context

processor for reading context rules in the document generation rules, and if a specific

business context satisfies the conditions of the context rules, applying designated

actions to the assembled components to thereby ultimately generate the grammar

neutral document objects. However, Person et al discloses in FIG. 6.2 using Microsoft

Word where a template is showing structural information where a table has been

implemented to produce a form layout, and additional structural information created to

divide the table into cells where text has been place. Thus, FIG 6.2 discloses assembly

rules used to create a form layout contain structural information to properly place

components for table and text where it was assembled. In addition, Person et al's

discloses where context conditions are used by the formulation rules where the

template created allowing the user to easily enter information by requiring only the user

just to point, click, and type to fill out a form. (Page 4, Paragraph 4; FIG 6.4) This

process acts as a context processor that discloses an embodiment using a template

showing context conditions allowing the user only have to point, click, and type

information in a already constructed form by the template's assembly and context rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's

disclosure since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool

one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency while

reducing company's costs when creating a document.

As per dependent Claim 7, Cornelia et al discloses a document output unit

saving final documents to the library after creating a document with components

(Column 15, lines 49-57) for business uses (Column 6, lines 43-47) However, Cornelia

et al and Person et al fail to specifically disclose a grammar converter supporting

grammar for specific business systems and converting the grammar neutral document

objects into grammar-connected document objects;

However, Meyer discloses using a tool extension to Microsoft Word that would

create validate XML documents using Microsoft World. Meyer's tool would convert the

MS Word document into XML generating a grammar-connected document (Page 116,

Right Column, lines 30-37) by making sure the document is valid and in compliance with

its DTD (Page 114, Right Column, Lines 30-31). An XML document is inherently

considered as a recognizable string format by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's and Person et al's methods

document generation with Meyer's aTool method to create XML document from Word

that would have provided the aTool as a hybrid solution that offers the benefits of MS

Word with the costs of a little less XML support.

As per independent Claim 8, Roberts et al discloses a method comprising:

- (a) storing document component summary information and document

  components that represent specific concepts; (Column 2, line 66 – Column 3,

  lines 1-2: discloses a library storing components used to be assembled to

  create new documents. In addition, Column 9, lines 44-49, discloses a option

  within Cornelia et al's application of a Find Component function that able to

  display a component dialog disclosing the component's name, description,

  author, text content etc. Since the component contains all this information and

  displays it, the library stores components that contain summary information

  which represent specific concepts.)

- (c) accumulating document components needed for document assembly and

  from a document component library, and generating grammar neutral

document objects based on the document generation rules', and (Column 20,

lines 60 – 65: discloses creating documents by dragging and dropping

language component icons where each icon represents a component.

Documents are created by the dragging and dropping components into a list

for the document thus creating non-grammar objects within a document.)

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose designating document

generation rules through a graphic user interface. However, Person et al discloses

Microsoft Word contains templates, which contain parts of a document and features

used for a specific type of document. (Page 1) Person et al discloses a form template,

where assembly and context rules are used in which the assembly rules are used to

create a table that creates a form while the context rules are used for font size and font

type for the text. (FIG 6.2) In addition, Person et al discloses that all Word documents

are based on a template wherein the default new document is based on a template

containing default formatting and settings. (Page 5, lines 5-6) Thus, the designation of

document rules occurs when loading a template in Word.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's

disclosure of templates since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word

template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and

consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

In addition, Cornelia et al and Person et al fail to specifically disclose converting

the grammar neutral document objects, which are suitable for semantic processing in a

program of a computer system, into grammar-connected documents in a human-readable string form used in an actual business. However, Meyer discloses using a tool extension to Microsoft Word that would create validate XML documents using Microsoft World. Meyer's tool would convert the MS Word document into XML generating a grammar-connected document (Page 116, Right Column, lines 30-37) by making sure the document is valid and compliance with its DTD (Page 114, Right Column, Lines 30-31). An XML document is inherently considered as a recognizable string format by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's and Person et al's methods of document generation with Meyer's aTool method of creating XML documents from Microsoft Word would have provided the aTool as a hybrid solution that offers the benefits of MS Word with the costs of a little less XML support.

As per dependent Claim 9, Cornelia et al discloses a method:

- displaying a list of usable components provided library based on the by a corresponding document component summary information searched in the document component library; (Column 9, lines 42-52: Discloses using a Find Component menu option to find components based on the component's information in which the system returns with a list of components in the library based on the component's information searched.)

- dragging required documents appearing in a component selector and dropping the documents at a suitable location in a document component

assembler, which forms an area where component structures are modeled

based on user input through a graphic user interface, to thereby generate

document structures; and (Column 20, line 60 – Column 21, line 4: Discloses

documents being created by dragging and dropping components into a list for

the document using a tree viewer. Once the list been created, the word

document with complete content is generated by a user action. This creation

creates a structured document containing components placed in a structural

manner.)

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose compiling context conditions

realized through pairs of conditions and actions, and allowing insertion of the context

conditions into document structures. However, Person et al discloses Word contains

templates, which contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of

document. (Page 1) However, Person et al discloses in FIG. 6.2 using Microsoft Word

where a template is showing structural information where a table has been implemented

to produce a form layout, and additional structural information created to divide the table

into cells where text has been place. Thus, FIG 6.2 discloses assembly rules used to

create a form layout contain structural information to properly place components for

table and text where it was assembled. In addition, Person et al's discloses where

context conditions are used by the formulation rules where the template created

allowing the user to easily enter information by requiring only the user just to point, click,

and type to fill out a form. (Page 4, Paragraph 4; FIG 6.4)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's disclosure of templates since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

As per dependent Claim 10, Cornelia et al discloses:

- accumulating from the document component library the document components required in the assembly rules using document component Ids, and outputting the resulting assembled components. (Column 9, lines 42-52: Discloses using a Find Component menu option to find components based on the component's information such as the component's name in which the system returns with a list of components in the library based on the component's information searched then allowing the author to insert the component into document thus outputting onto the document.)

Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose assembling the document components using structural information between components and reading assembly and context rules in the document generation rules, and if a specific business context satisfies the conditions of the context rules, applying designated actions to the assembled components to thereby ultimately generate the grammar neutral document objects. However, Person et al discloses Word contains templates, which contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of document. (Page 1) Person et al

discloses in FIG. 6.2 using Microsoft Word where a template is showing structural

information where a table has been implemented to produce a form layout, and

additional structural information created to divide the table into cells where text has

been place. Thus, FIG 6.2 discloses assembly rules used to create a form layout

contain structural information to properly place components for table and text where it

was assembled. In addition, Person et al's discloses where context conditions are used

by the formulation rules where the template created allowing the user to easily enter

information by requiring only the user just to point, click, and type to fill out a form.

(Page 4, Paragraph 4; FIG 6.4) This process acts as a context processor that discloses

an embodiment using a template showing context conditions allowing the user only

have to point, click, and type information in a already constructed form by the template's

assembly and context rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's

disclosure of templates since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word

template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and

consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

As per dependent Claim 11, Cornelia disclose saving final documents to the

library after creating a document with components (Column 15, lines 49-57) for

business uses (Column 6, lines 43-47) However, Cornelia et al and Person et al fail to

specifically disclose supporting grammar for specific business systems and converting

the grammar neutral document objects into grammar-connected document objects.

However, Meyer discloses using a tool extension to Microsoft Word that would

create validate XML documents using Microsoft World. Meyer's tool would convert the

MS Word document into XML generating a grammar-connected document (Page 116,

Right Column, lines 30-37) by making sure the document is valid and complaint with its

DTD (Page 114, Right Column, Lines 30-31). An XML document is inherently

considered as a recognizable string format by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's and Person et al's methods of

document generation with Meyer's aTool method of creating XML documents from

Microsoft Word would have provided the aTool as a hybrid solution that offers the

benefits of MS Word with the costs of a little less XML support.

As per independent Claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8

and is similarly rejected under Cornelia et al, Person et al, and Meyer.

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments filed 17 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

First, Applicant admits in the Remarks that a grammar neutral document object is

"accumulated from document components from a document component library under

the control of document generation rules designated by the user of the system". The

grammar neutral document object can be viewed as just text. Cornelia discloses

individual components in a library (see rejection of claim 1). Cornelia discloses that

each component is a unit of text shared among documents and that Cornelia invention

uses Microsoft Word by managing the components. With the help and further view of

Person et al's Microsoft Word template (see reasons of obvious and motivation as is in

the rejection of Claim 1), the component could be using a template based on the default

formatting and settings as designation of document rules, making the component just

ordinary text without any special specific rules.

In regards to the amendments, Applicant adds the term "semantic" to "program

processing" to indicate that the processing occurs on the basis of the meaning of a

grammar neutral document object, and not simply the letters or words of a text string.

Each component has meaning over another component representing a particular topic.

FIG 15 discloses a list of components wherein each component name indicates a

particular meaning of that component distinguishing one from another. In addition,

components are classification to categorize language components. Thus, categories

added meaning to the components. Thus, each component has some form of meaning

to distinguish from each other. In addition, when using the tree viewer by Cornelia, the

user, and computer can distinguish each component from one another.

Furthermore, Applicant adds the term "human-readable" to "string" in a

subsequent element to provide further distinction to the grammar-connect document,

wherein the disclose the fact to the Examiner it is not an XML document, but rather an

ordinary text document that a human could read and understand without difficulty.

However, the Examiner is confused by Applicant's argument in regards to the

explanation of that limitation of the claim in the specification. Page 12, lines 17-20 of the specification clearly state as is: "The grammar neutral document object is converted into a grammar-connect document object through a grammar converter, which supports grammar, (e.g. XML schema, XML DTD, EDI MIG) suitable for a specific business system. Applicant arguing that the grammar-connected documents are ordinary text documents; however, the specification discloses the ability of the use of XML grammar which help create XML documents, wherein Meyer reference clearly discloses. In addition, an XML document is full of strings that are human-readable especially by one in ordinary skill in the art, and Applicant clearly admits in Remarks that can be deciphered by a person, wherein one of ordinary skill in the art can read the document. Since the specification clearly states the use of XML grammar to make grammar-connected documents, the limitation remains rejected by the further view of Meyer to Cornelia and Person.

In regards to Applicant's arguments of claims 1-8 and 12 rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statuary subject matter, Examiner admits 1-8 should have been 1-7 being claim 8 was a typo. However, Claims 1-7 still remain rejected under 35 USC 101. Applicant argues that claims 1-7 are drawn to an automatic document generation system comprising a number of functional elements, such as a document generation rule generator or a document component library the Applicant has listed. However, Applicant has fully admitted on record in the remarks that "these elements could be implemented by software" acknowledges that claims 1-7 could be viewed as a software system which no indication of hardware being used with the system, and thus

resulting in non-statuary matter. Examiner suggests viewing MPEP 2106 for further

information in regards to this matter.

Conclusion

13.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Faber
Patient Examiner
AU 2178

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER